

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
MEDFORD DIVISION

JESSICA MARIE HOLLAND,

Case No. 1:18-cv-00576-CL  
**ORDER**

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant,

---

AIKEN, District Judge.

Magistrate Judge Mark Clarke has filed his Findings and Recommendations (“F&R”) (Doc. 27) recommending that the decision of the Commissioner be reversed and this case be remanded for further administrative procedures. This matter is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

No objections to the F&R have been timely filed. Although this relieves me of my obligation to perform a *de novo* review, I retain the obligation to “make an informed, final decision.” *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), *overruled on other grounds, United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Magistrates Act does not specify a

standard of review in cases where no objections are filed. *Ray v. Astrue*, 2012 WL 1598239, \*1 (D. Or. May 7, 2012). Following the recommendation of the Rules Advisory Committee, the Court review the F&R for “clear error on the face of the record[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (1983) (citing *Campbell v. United States District Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); *see also United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 64 n.6 (2002) (stating that, “[i]n the absence of a clear legislative mandate, the Advisory Committee Notes provide a reliable source of insight into the meaning of” a federal rule).

The Court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Clarke’s F&R. Accordingly, the Court adopts the F&R (Doc. 27) in its entirety. The decision of the Commissioner is REVERSED, and this case is REMANDED for further administrative procedures consistent with the F&R. This action is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 8th day of September 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/Ann Aiken  
Ann Aiken  
United States District Judge